

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1 and 9 – 16 have been amended. Claims 17 - 20 have been added. No new matter has been added. Hence, Claims 1 - 20 are pending in the application.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. 101**

Claims 9 - 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended Claims 9 - 16 by inserting “storage” in the phrase “computer-readable storage medium.” Applicants respectfully assert that amended Claims 9 - 16 are directed towards statutory subject matter.

**THE REJECTIONS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART**

Claims 1 - 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,062,541 to Cannon. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Support for the amendment to Claim 1 may be found in the specification at least in paragraph 47.

**CLAIMS 1, 5 and 6**

Cannon does not teach, “**from a first set of one or more system tables** at the source installation, **copying** metadata that defines the selected set of migrating objects **into** a first set of **transport tables** at the source installation,” as recited in Claim 1.

Referring to FIG. 5, Cannon shows an object attributes table [54], which the Office Action apparently interprets as a first set of transport tables. However, Cannon at the passage cited in the Office Action does not disclose how the object attributes table is populated. Therefore, Cannon does not teach the limitations of Claim 1.

Furthermore, Cannon fails to teach “the first set of transport tables are mirrors of the first set of system tables, and include one or more columns in addition to the columns of the first set of system tables,” as recited in Claim 5. Applicants have reviewed Cannon, including the passage at col. 8, lines 28-38 cited in the Office Action in support of the rejection to Claim 5. No where in Cannon have Applicants found mention of any table, system or otherwise, that the object attributes table 54 mirror, and include one or more columns in addition to.

Further Cannon does not teach, “importing the metadata that was exported from the first set of transport tables into a second set of transport tables at the target installation site; and **“merging the metadata from the second set of transport tables into a second set of one or more system tables at the target installation,”** as recited in Claim 1.

Cannon discloses that attributes [56] are received at the target server and preferably stored in the RAM buffer (col. 12, lines 9 – 15). Cannon does not explicitly state that object attribute tables [54] from the source server are transferred to the target server. Thus, Cannon does not teach that the attributes [56] stored in the RAM buffer are stored in a table. Therefore, the act of storing the attributes [56] in the RAM buffer at the target does not result in “importing the metadata that was exported from the first set of transport tables into a second set of transport tables at the target installation site,” as recited in Claim 1.

Cannon may disclose that some or all of the attributes [56] may be stored in the object attribute table [81] on the target server (col. 13, lines 19 – 21). However, this is apparently a transfer of the attributes [56] from the RAM buffer to the object attribute table [81]. This data transfer from RAM to a table is not merging metadata from a first set of tables to a second set of tables. Therefore, Cannon clearly fails to teach “merging the metadata from the second set of

transport tables into a second set of one or more system tables at the target installation,” as claimed.

Furthermore, Cannon fails to teach “the second set of transport tables are mirrors of the second set of system tables, and include one or more columns in addition to the columns of the second set of system tables,” as recited in Claim 6. Cannon at col. 12, lines 25 – 35, which is cited in the Office Action in support of the rejection to Claim 6 discloses that **attributes** may be stored in RAM. However, Cannon does not disclose that the **object attribute table** is stored in RAM. Therefore, the attributes in RAM cannot be the second set of system tables that are mirrored by the transport tables. Moreover, there is no reason to infer that the object attribute table 81 on the target server would **mirror** attributes stored in RAM.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Claims 1, 5 and 6 are not taught by Cannon.

## CLAIM 2

Cannon fails to teach “copying data from the dump file into the section set of system tables by **invoking an import utility of a database server** that manages a database containing the second set of system tables,” as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that Cannon does not indicate that the import application (FIG. 2, 44) is a part of a database server. Further Cannon does not indicate that the import application invokes an import utility of a database server. Therefore, the claim limitations are not taught.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Claim 2 is not taught by Cannon.

#### CLAIM 4

Cannon does not teach that “the objects are application components created for an application by an application design tool associated with the first installation,” as recited in Claim 4. Cannon may disclose that data objects in some common group may be transferred. However, Cannon does not teach the above limitations. While Cannon may indicate that the invention is not limited to the specific implementations disclosed therein, such a vague statement does not teach the limitations of Claim 4.

#### DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The dependent claims not discussed so far are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from Claim 1. The dependent claims contain additional limitations that distinguish over the art.

#### NEW CLAIMS

Claims 17 - 20 have been added. Support for Claims 17 - 18 may be found in the specification at least in paragraph 20. Support for Claims 19 - 20 may be found in the specification at least in paragraphs 21 and 25. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully assert that Cannon fails to teach “the one or more system tables at the source installation comprise metadata pertaining to objects created by an application design tool,” as recited in Claim 17. Claim 18 includes similar limitations.

Therefore, Claims 17 and 18 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully assert that Cannon fails to teach “merging the set of migrating objects with pre-existing data in the target installation in accordance with a specified mode that

dictates how the set of migrating objects and the pre-existing data are to be reconciled," as recited in Claim 19. Claim 20 includes similar limitations.

Therefore, Claims 19 and 20 are allowable.


For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ronald M. Pomeranke  
Reg. No. 43,009

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, CA 95110  
(408) 414-1080  
**Date: February 12, 2007**  
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on Feb. 12, 2007 by Trudy Bagdon  
Trudy Bagdon